UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA * * * UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, 2:11-cr-048-JCM-CWH VS. FRANCISCO FLORES-JORGE, et al., Defendant. AMENDED ORDER

Presently before the court is defendant Francisco Flores-Jorge's motion to dismiss counsel. (Doc. # 264). The motion requests that this court dismiss counsel and appoint new counsel for sentencing proceedings. The sentencing hearing is currently set for October 2, 2012, at 10:30 a.m.

Pursuant to the District of Nevada's Local Rules, "[a] party who has appeared by attorney cannot while so represented appear or act in the case." LR IA 10-6. Here, Mr. Flores-Jorge has appeared by his attorney. As such, he cannot file pro se motions; however, the circumstances surrounding Mr. Flores-Jorge's instant motion warrant an exception from this general rule.

On August 9, 2012, Mr. Flores-Jorge filed the instant motion. (Doc. # 264). Mr. Flores-Jorge represents to the court that since entering a plea of guilty, "there's no communication at all despite Mr. Flores [sic] attempts to contact Mr. Roske." (Doc. # 264, 2). It appears that Mr. Flores-Jorge's main contention is that Mr. Roske misinformed Mr. Flores-Jorge as to the applicable sentencing guidelines in Mr. Flores-Jorge's case. To date, neither the government nor Mr. Flores-Jorge's attorney has responded. Without more, the court cannot determine whether there has been a breakdown in communication sufficient to require substitution of new counsel. See United States v. Nguyen, 262 F.3d 998, 1005 (9th Cir. 2001); see also United States v. Moore, 159 F.3d 1154, 1159-60 (9th Cir. 1998).

Thus, the court finds this matter appropriate for an ex parte hearing.

1	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED, that Mr. Flores-Jorge's motion
2	to dismiss counsel (doc. # 264) is set for an ex parte hearing on Thursday, September 20, 2012, a t
3	10:30 a.m.
4	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the U.S. Marshal Service shall transport Mr. Flores-Jorge
5	from his current detention facility to the Lloyd D. George U.S. Courthouse for the purposes of
6	attending this hearing.
7	DATED September 11, 2012.
8	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10	ONTED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	